

# LUSITANIA CASE IS HELD UP BY THE PRESIDENT

## Secretary Lansing Still Waits for a Summons to White House

## White House.

## DEMANDS THAT NEW

marks Attributed to Under Sec'y Zimmermann.

## SENATOR STONE SAYS

## SETTLEMENT IS NEAR

## Bernstorff Is Believed to Have Something Up His Sleeve.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 7.—Secretary Lansing is still waiting for a summons from the White House to discuss with the President the latest proposals from Berlin for a settlement of the Lusitanian controversy.

Until the President gives the word Secretary Lansing is unable to inform the German Ambassador whether or not Germany's latest offer can be accepted. There are still strong indications that

will at least form the basis of further negotiations looking to a settlement.

All day Secretary Lansing was accepting an invitation from the President to confer with him. During the morning, however, the President was engaged with members of Congress, and

It was recalled to-night that at the time the Lusitania was sunk, when the country was anxiously waiting to know what representations the State Department would send to Berlin, it was several days before the President sent for and conferred with Secretary Bryan.

In view of the uncertainty of the President's attitude officials of the State Department to-night advised against too much being taken for granted on the way or another. Already there is being mooted in White House circles a recent report granting reports emanating from

**A Denial by Mr. Lansing.**

Secretary Lansing, who had refused heretofore to comment on these reports, today to the statesmen attributed in Berlin press despatches under Secretary Zimmermann of the Berlin Foreign Office that the United States government at the last moment should have presented new demands which Germany could not accept. Col-

This Government has not increased the demands made in the Lusitania case as set forth in the notes of May 13, June 9 and July 21. I doubt if Dr. Zimmermann ever made the statement that new demands had been projected, because he must know that it is utterly false.

Chairman William J. Storr of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who called at the White House soon after the statement was made, left with a distinct idea that a settlement is in sight. He said that his impression was that the Lusitania case "was practical, settled," and that he was not the least apprehensive over the outcome. "The senators from Missouri added, however, that there may be a further exchange of notes between this Government and Berlin."

Persons in close touch with the German Embassy continued to express the utmost confidence in an early settlement.

**Reason for Delay.**

Significant, perhaps, of the reason for the delay on the part of the Administration in passing judgment on the German memorandum is the fact, ascertained last night, that certain officials of the Administration are disposed to believe that Count von Bernstorff has in reserve still more acceptable offer, should the United States reject the last proposals.

Although the assurance is conveyed both from the German Embassy and from the German Government that Germany has made a

From Berlin, however, it is recalled that the last possible concession, it is recalled, that these officials, that similar assurance had accompanied the original offer of settlement made by Germany in the Arabah case.

When, however, this offer was flatly rejected, the German Ambassador was back at the State Department in less than an hour with a new proposal meeting absolutely the demands of the United States.

That the President may have a suspicion that Count von Bernstorff is holding back something in the present situation is suggested in certain quarters. A possible explanation of Senator Stow-

**Difference of Opinion.**—Objecting to the use of the word "legal" Germany has sought to evade by admitting that the presence of Americans on board justified a demand to land them on the State Government.

democracy. It is not clear whether the opinion seems to differ as to whether a language used is sufficient to embrace a formal recognition of the principle, for which the United States has been contending, that reprisals which call for the sinking of unarmed merchantmen without warning, with consequent danger to neutrals on board, are illegal. The